

EXHIBIT C

Adam Steinfeld

From: Neill Clark [nclark@bm.net]
Sent: Monday, October 02, 2006 1:23 PM
To: Peterman, Chad J. (x2877)
Cc: Peter Kohn; Andrew Kelly; Stuart Des Roches; Adam Steinfeld; cholding@goodwinprocter.com
Subject: Tricor: Teva 30(b)(6) Witnesses

Dear Chad:

As you might know, Teva is cross-designating Paul Krauthauser and Luis Jorge, in response to Direct and Indirect Purchasers' 30(B)(6) Notice, and will likely do the same for Jon Wodarczyk, Joe Grotzinger and George Morabito. As suggested by Chris Holding in his September 11, 2006 letter to you that Plaintiffs and Defendants allocate the time amongst themselves as appropriate, Plaintiffs think an equitable resolution of the time issues is to give defendants 3.5 hours of clocked time and plaintiffs the same.

Please let me know defendants' position on this issue as soon as possible so that we may plan accordingly.

Sincerely,

Neill Clark

PRIVILEGED ATTORNEY/CLIENT COMMUNICATION AND/OR ATTORNEY WORK PRODUCT. The information in this transmittal may be privileged and/or confidential. It is intended only for the recipient(s) listed above. If you are neither the intended recipient(s) nor a person responsible for the delivery of this transmittal to the intended recipient(s), you are hereby notified that any distribution or copying of this transmittal is prohibited. If you have received this transmittal in error, please notify Berger & Montague, P.C. immediately at (215) 875-3000 or by return e-mail. Pursuant to requirements related to practice before the U. S. Internal Revenue Service, any tax advice contained in this communication (including any attachments) is not intended to be used, and cannot be used, for purposes of (i) avoiding penalties imposed under the U. S. Internal Revenue Code or (ii) promoting, marketing or recommending to another person any tax-related matter.

10/3/2006

Adam Steinfeld

From: Peterman, Chad J. (x2877) [cjpeterman@pbwt.com]
Sent: Monday, October 02, 2006 2:17 PM
To: Neill Clark
Cc: Peter Kohn; Andrew Kelly; Stuart Des Roches; Adam Steinfeld; cholding@goodwinprocter.com
Subject: RE: Tricor: Teva 30(b)(6) Witnesses

Neill -

Your proposal is not acceptable.
We will take up to our full allotment of time under the FRCP.

Regards,
Chad

-----Original Message-----

From: Neill Clark [mailto:nclark@bm.net]
Sent: Monday, October 02, 2006 1:23 PM
To: Peterman, Chad J. (x2877)
Cc: Peter Kohn; Andrew Kelly; Stuart Des Roches; Adam Steinfeld; cholding@goodwinprocter.com
Subject: Tricor: Teva 30(b)(6) Witnesses

Dear Chad:

As you might know, Teva is cross-designating Paul Krauthauser and Luis Jorge, in response to Direct and Indirect Purchasers' 30(B)(6) Notice, and will likely do the same for Jon Wodarczyk, Joe Grotzinger and George Morabito. As suggested by Chris Holding in his September 11, 2006 letter to you that Plaintiffs and Defendants allocate the time amongst themselves as appropriate, Plaintiffs think an equitable resolution of the time issues is to give defendants 3.5 hours of clocked time and plaintiffs the same.

Please let me know defendants' position on this issue as soon as possible so that we may plan accordingly.

Sincerely,

Neill Clark

PRIVILEGED ATTORNEY/CLIENT COMMUNICATION AND/OR ATTORNEY WORK PRODUCT. The information in this transmittal may be privileged and/or confidential. It is intended only for the recipient(s) listed above. If you are neither the intended recipient(s) nor a person responsible for the delivery of this transmittal to the intended recipient(s), you are hereby notified that any distribution or copying of this transmittal is prohibited. If you have received this transmittal in error, please notify Berger & Montague, P.C. immediately at (215) 875-3000 or by return e-mail. Pursuant to requirements related to practice before the U. S. Internal Revenue Service, any tax advice contained in this communication (including any attachments) is not intended to be used, and cannot be used, for purposes of (i) avoiding penalties imposed under the U. S. Internal Revenue Code or (ii) promoting, marketing or recommending to another person any tax-related matter.

10/3/2006

Adam Steinfeld

From: Andrew Kelly [akelly@odrlaw.com]
Sent: Monday, October 02, 2006 4:19 PM
To: Peterman, Chad J. (x2877); Neill Clark
Cc: Peter Kohn; Stuart Des Roches; Adam Steinfeld; cholding@goodwinprocter.com
Subject: RE: Tricor: Teva 30(b)(6) Witnesses

Chad,
Andrew Kelly here, from Odom & Des Roches, with the Direct Purchaser Class.
As you have probably seen, I have been copied on the email exchange between yourself and Neill Clark, below.

In an effort at compliance with sections IV (B) and IV (D) of the Court's scheduling order of July 29, 2005, and in an effort to resolve the issue in a reasonable manner, we have offered to split deposition time with Defendants on a 50/50 basis as to witnesses either noticed by both plaintiffs and defendants, or designated by other parties as 30-b-6 witnesses in response to notices by both plaintiffs and defendants. You have rejected this offer, and stated that you are not willing to compromise on this issue.

We view your position, as put forth below, as unreasonable and in contradiction of the scheduling order provisions noted above. As you are not willing to accept our offer, nor are you willing to put forth a reasonable compromise in response, we view this matter as having reached an impasse. Unless we hear otherwise from you by 6:00 p.m. eastern time today, we will be filing papers with the court in the morning seeking to have this matter adjudicated at the previously-scheduled hearing set for Friday, 10/6/06. While we are reluctant to seek judicial intervention on an issue on which reasonable parties should be able to reach agreement, your response has left us with no alternative.

Thank you.
Andrew Kelly
Odom & Des Roches, LLP

From: Peterman, Chad J. (x2877) [mailto:cjpeterman@pbwt.com]
Sent: Monday, October 02, 2006 1:17 PM
To: Neill Clark
Cc: Peter Kohn; Andrew Kelly; Stuart Des Roches; Adam Steinfeld; cholding@goodwinprocter.com
Subject: RE: Tricor: Teva 30(b)(6) Witnesses

Neill -

Your proposal is not acceptable.
We will take up to our full allotment of time under the FRCP.

Regards,
Chad

-----Original Message-----

From: Neill Clark [mailto:nclark@bm.net]
Sent: Monday, October 02, 2006 1:23 PM
To: Peterman, Chad J. (x2877)
Cc: Peter Kohn; Andrew Kelly; Stuart Des Roches; Adam Steinfeld; cholding@goodwinprocter.com
Subject: Tricor: Teva 30(b)(6) Witnesses

Dear Chad:

As you might know, Teva is cross-designating Paul Krauthauser and Luis Jorge, in response to Direct and Indirect Purchasers' 30(B)(6) Notice, and will likely do the same for Jon Wodarczyk, Joe Grotzinger and

10/3/2006

Adam Steinfeld

From: Peterman, Chad J. (x2877) [cjpeterman@pbwt.com]
Sent: Monday, October 02, 2006 5:34 PM
To: Andrew Kelly; Neill Clark
Cc: Peter Kohn; Stuart Des Roches; Adam Steinfeld; cholding@goodwinprocter.com
Subject: RE: Tricor: Teva 30(b)(6) Witnesses

Andrew -

Given the fact that plaintiffs sued us, my response is entirely reasonable. We have an absolute right to defend ourselves and to take full discovery. The fact that you noticed a co-plaintiff of yours does not change or otherwise limit our discovery rights. We are not going to agree in advance to limit our deposition time of any witness. There are many issues and documents for each witness that are relevant to our defenses. While some of our depositions may be shorter, I expect that most will run close to the seven hours we are allowed under the FRCP.

Regards,
Chad

-----Original Message-----

From: Andrew Kelly [mailto:akelly@odrlaw.com]
Sent: Monday, October 02, 2006 4:19 PM
To: Peterman, Chad J. (x2877); Neill Clark
Cc: Peter Kohn; Stuart Des Roches; Adam Steinfeld; cholding@goodwinprocter.com
Subject: RE: Tricor: Teva 30(b)(6) Witnesses

Chad,
Andrew Kelly here, from Odom & Des Roches, with the Direct Purchaser Class.
As you have probably seen, I have been copied on the email exchange between yourself and Neill Clark, below.

In an effort at compliance with sections IV (B) and IV (D) of the Court's scheduling order of July 29, 2005, and in an effort to resolve the issue in a reasonable manner, we have offered to split deposition time with Defendants on a 50/50 basis as to witnesses either noticed by both plaintiffs and defendants, or designated by other parties as 30-b-6 witnesses in response to notices by both plaintiffs and defendants. You have rejected this offer, and stated that you are not willing to compromise on this issue.

We view your position, as put forth below, as unreasonable and in contradiction of the scheduling order provisions noted above. As you are not willing to accept our offer, nor are you willing to put forth a reasonable compromise in response, we view this matter as having reached an impasse. Unless we hear otherwise from you by 6:00 p.m. eastern time today, we will be filing papers with the court in the morning seeking to have this matter adjudicated at the previously-scheduled hearing set for Friday, 10/6/06. While we are reluctant to seek judicial intervention on an issue on which reasonable parties should be able to reach agreement, your response has left us with no alternative.

Thank you.
Andrew Kelly
Odom & Des Roches, LLP

From: Peterman, Chad J. (x2877) [mailto:cjpeterman@pbwt.com]
Sent: Monday, October 02, 2006 1:17 PM

10/3/2006